



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,897	08/23/2001	John W. Evans	290397.0012	2267

21832 7590 10/04/2006

MCCARTER & ENGLISH LLP
CITYPLACE I
185 ASYLUM STREET
HARTFORD, CT 06103

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/935,897

Applicant(s)

EVANS ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory R. Del Cotto

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed 7/10/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 26, 27, 30-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 26, 27, 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 22, 26, 27, and 30-32 are pending. Claims 1-21, 23-25, 28, and 29 have been canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/10/06 has been entered.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

The following objections/rejection(s) as set forth in the Office action mailed 2/9/06 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, with respect to the terminology "that is at least between about one percent by weight and less than 30% by weight of the sum of the weight of the ethylene glycol fraction and the weight of the second glycol" and "at least 10,000 mg/kg", has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and

Art Unit: 1751

use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With respect to instant claims 30 and 32, the specification as originally filed, provides no basis for "wherein the aqueous fluid containing ethylene glycol and the second glycol comprises more than 10 percent by weight water". Thus, this is deemed new matter.

With respect to claim 31, the specification, as originally filed, provides no basis for "about" 20 as recited by instant claim 31. While the specification does provide basis for 20% by weight of glycerol, the specification does not provide basis for "about" 20 as recited by instant claim 31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 1751

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the

Art Unit: 1751

prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 22, 26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hu et al (US 5,817,252) or Wiesenfeld et al (US 5,935,488).

Hu et al teach a deicing and anti-icing composition for aircraft surfaces including a base compound being propylene glycol and/or ethylene glycol in the range of 35% to 80% by weight of the composition. A diluent is included in the

Art Unit: 1751

form of water for use as a carrier fluid for the glycol. See Abstract. The water used in the composition having both ethylene glycol and propylene glycol has the diluent water in an overall range of 20% to 65% by weight of the composition.

See column 5, lines 20-45.

Specifically, Hu et al teach compositions containing 1% propylene glycol, 79% ethylene glycol, 19.5% water, 0.171% lower MW nonionic, 0.012% higher MW nonionic, and 0.184% polycarboxylate and compositions containing 1% propylene glycol, 34% ethylene glycol, 64.5% water, 0.171% lower MW nonionic, 0.012% higher MW nonionic, and 0.184% polycarboxylate. Note that, the Examiner asserts that the compositions taught by Hu et al would inherently have the same reduced oral toxicity as the composition recited by the instant claims because Hu et al teach compositions containing the same components in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims. Hu et al discloses the claimed invention with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Wiesenfeld et al teach a concentrated deicing and anti-icing composition which is diluted and is primarily used for aircraft surfaces being a mixture including a deicing and anti-icing base compound being propylene glycol and/or ethylene glycol in the overall range of 78% to 95% by weight of the deicing and anti-icing composition. A diluent is included in the form of water for use as a carrier fluid of the glycol in the overall range of 5% to 22% by weight of the deicing and anti-icing composition. See Abstract.

Specifically, Wiesenfeld et al teach compositions containing 10% by weight propylene glycol, 78.2% ethylene glycol, 11.17% water, 0.191% first

Art Unit: 1751

nonionic, 0.033% second nonionic, and 0.202% polycarboxylate and a composition containing 1% propylene glycol, 87.2% ethylene glycol, 11.17% water, 0.191% first nonionic, 0.033% second nonionic, and 0.202% polycarboxylate. See column 9, lines 25-60. Note that, the Examiner asserts that the compositions taught by Wiesenfeld et al would inherently have the same reduced oral toxicity as the composition recited by the instant claims because Wiesenfeld et al teach compositions containing the same components in the same amounts as recited by the instant claims. Wiesenfeld et al disclose the claimed invention with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Accordingly, the teachings of Hu et al or Wiesenfeld et al disclose the claimed invention with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu et al (5,817,252) or Wiesenfeld et al (US 5,935,488).

Hu et al or Wiesenfeld et al are relied upon as set forth above. However, Hu et al or Wiesenfeld et al do not teach, with sufficient specificity, a composition containing propylene glycol such that the sum of propylene glycol in the resulting mixture is about 5 weight percent of the sum of the total weight of ethylene glycol and propylene glycol in the mixture as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a composition containing propylene glycol such that the sum of propylene glycol in the resulting mixture is about 5 weight percent of the sum of the total weight of ethylene glycol and propylene glycol in the mixture as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of

Art Unit: 1751

success, because the broad teachings of Hu et al or Wiesenfeld et al suggest a composition containing propylene glycol such that the sum of propylene glycol in the resulting mixture is about 5 weight percent of the sum of the total weight of ethylene glycol and propylene glycol in the mixture as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 22, 26, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 89/09806.

'806 teaches a coolant composition containing an alkylene glycol such as propylene glycol, a corrosion inhibitor combination of an azole such as tolyltriazole, a molybdate salt and phosphoric acid, and less than 10% by weight water. See Abstract. The composition contains at least 90 weight percent of an alkylene glycol or a mixture of two or more alkylene glycols and a corrosion inhibiting amount of an inhibitor. See page 3, lines 1-15. Suitable alkylene glycols include ethylene glycol, propylene glycol, glycerol, and mixtures thereof. Mixture of two or more glycols are suitable in any proportion. See page 3, line 30 to page 4, line 12.

Specifically, '806 teaches a coolant composition containing 30 parts propylene glycol, 70 parts ethylene glycol, 1 part water, 0.25 parts azole, 0.15 parts molybdate, and 0.075 parts phosphoric acid. See page 9. Note that, the Examiner asserts that the teachings of '806 would suggest compositions having reduced oral toxicity as recited by the instant claims because '806 teaches mixtures containing ethylene glycol and propylene glycol in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1751

'806 does not teach, with sufficient specificity, a method of reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to reduce the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because the teaching of '806 suggest reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 22, 26, 27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al (US 5,118,434) or Maes et al (US 5,366,651).

Meyer et al teach antifreeze fluids containing 50 to 99 percent by weight of one or more glycols, 0.001 to 15 percent by weight of one or more corrosion inhibitors, 25 to 2500 parts of a polymeric additive, and optionally, up to 50 percent by weight of water. See column 1, line 50 to column 2, line 5. Suitable glycols include ethylene glycol, propylene glycol, etc. See column 2, lines 40-60.

Maes et al teach antifreeze concentrates containing a water-soluble liquid alcohol freezing point depressant and a corrosion inhibitor comprising carboxylic acids or their salts and a triazole compound. See column 2, lines 55-69. Suitable freeze point depressants include glycols such as ethylene glycol, propylene glycols, etc. The composition contains from 10 to 90% by weight

Art Unit: 1751

water and 25% to 50% by weight of a water-soluble liquid alcohol freezing point depressant. See column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 20.

Note that, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of Meyer et al or Maes et al would suggest compositions having reduced toxicity because Meyer et al or Maes et al suggest compositions containing the same components in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Meyer et al or Maes et al do not teach, with sufficient specificity, a method of reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to reduce the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because the teaching of Meyer et al or Maes et al suggest reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Claims 22, 26, 27, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (US 4,728,452) or Wood (US 4,455,248).

Hansen teaches a coolant concentrate comprising water, at least 10% by weight of a water soluble nitrite, 0.2 to 2% by weight of at least one water soluble azole, and 0.1 to 1% by weight of a water soluble molybdate. See abstract. The

Art Unit: 1751

coolant concentrate may be totally aqueous or may contain freezing point depressing amounts of at least one alcohol, at least one glycol, or mixtures of one or more alcohol and glycol. The alcohol, glycol or alcohol-glycol mixture may comprise about 20% to 90% by weight of the aqueous concentrate. Suitable glycols include ethylene glycol, propylene glycol, glycerol, etc. See column 3, lines 25-50.

Wood teaches a single-phase glycol based antifreeze composition containing one or more glycols selected from the group consisting of ethylene glycol, propylene glycol, glycerol, etc., and additionally comprising for every 100 parts by weight of said alcohol, 0.1 to 500 parts by weight water, 0.05 to 0.3 parts by weight of sodium metasilicate, from 1.2 to 4.0 parts by weight of a phosphate of potassium, from 0.15 to 0.5 parts of sodium metaborate, etc. See column 2, lines 25-45.

Note that, the Examiner asserts that the broad teachings of Hansen or Wood would suggest compositions having reduced toxicity because Hansen or Wood suggest compositions containing the same components in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Hansen or Wood do not teach, with sufficient specificity, a method of reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to reduce the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing

Art Unit: 1751

ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because the teachings of Hansen or Wood suggest reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 22, 26, and 27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 27-50 of 09/910497 and claims 30-33 of 09/935982. Note that with respect to claims 27-50 of 10/910497 and claims 30 and 40-45 of 09/935982, although these claims recite "non-aqueous", the term "non-aqueous" as defined in the specifications of these applications allows for the presence of some water which would fall within the normal meaning of "aqueous" as recited by the instant

Art Unit: 1751

claims. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 27-50 of 09/910497 and claims 30 and 40-45 of 09/935982 encompass the material limitations of the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to reduce the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because claims 27-50 of 09/910497 and claims 30 and 40-45 of 09/935982 suggest reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 22, 26, 27, and 30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9, 11, and 12 of copending Application No. 10/264041. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-9, 11, and 12 of 10/264041 encompass the material limitations of the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to reduce the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene

Art Unit: 1751

glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims, with a reasonable expectation of success, because claims 1-9, 11, and 12 of copending Application No. 10/264041 suggest reducing the oral toxicity of aqueous fluids containing ethylene glycol by mixing with ethylene glycol a specific diol such as propylene glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Argument

With respect to '806, Maes et al, Meyer et al, Hansen, or Wood, Applicant once again states none of these references describe a method for reducing the oral toxicity of an ethylene glycol based heat transfer fluid by adding a second glycol as recited by the instant claims and none of these references teach combining ethylene glycol and a second glycol in the specific proportions as recited by the instant claims. Additionally, Applicant states that it is a mere possibility that the compositions as taught by '806, Maes et al, Meyer et al, Hansen, or Wood might have reduced toxicity as recited by the instant claims. In response, note that, the Examiner asserts that '806, Maes et al, Meyer et al, Wood, or Hansen clearly suggest compositions having the same reduced toxicity as the recited by the instant claims because '806, Maes et al, Meyer et al, Wood, or Hansen suggest compositions containing the same components in the same proportions as recited by the instant claims. The teachings of '806, Maes et al, Meyer et al, Wood, or Hansen suggest varying amounts of glycol ethers which would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to formulate a composition

Art Unit: 1751

containing the same proportion of ethylene glycol and second glycol as recited by the instant claims. Additionally, although '806, Maes et al, Meyer et al, Wood, or Hansen do not make specific mention of reduced toxicity properties, the Examiner asserts, once again that the reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. See MPEP 2144; In re Linter, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972).

With respect to Maes et al, Applicant states that there is a distinction between glycols and glycol ethers. In response, note that Maes et al teach that suitable glycols include ethylene glycol and propylene glycol and the Examiner asserts that one skilled in the art would be motivated to use a combination of both ethylene and propylene glycol. Note that, It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions, each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose...[T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP 2144.06.

Additionally, Applicant has reiterated that on pages 17-21 of the specification, unexpected and superior results of the claimed invention are shown with respect to toxicity. The Examiner asserts, as stated previously, that this data is insufficient to overcome the prior art rejections applied above. It is

Art Unit: 1751

unclear to the Examiner exactly what unexpected results are being shown; it seems that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that the toxicity of ethylene glycol would be reduced when combined with propylene glycol since propylene glycol is much less toxic than ethylene glycol. Thus, the data does not appear to show any unexpected and superior results but just merely shows what would be expected. Furthermore, new rejections have been made under 35 USC 102(b) as set forth above and secondary considerations such as evidence showing unexpected and superior results is not sufficient to overcome rejections under 35 USC 102.

With respect to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections, the Examiner asserts that claims 27-50 of 09/910497, claims 30 and 40-45 of 09/935982, and claims 1-9, 11, and 12 of 10/264041 suggest all the material limitations of the instant claims. Additionally, note that, a complete, full Office action includes all applicable rejections including provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections.

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.


Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Gregory R. Del Cotto
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

GRD
September 27, 2006